



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

BRIEF MENTION.

In Dr. FENNELL's paper on the *Indo-European Vowel System* he says, p. 32: 'Vagueness and confusion will gradually be eliminated from our ideas of primitive accentuation when we have learned to keep the stress which is the characteristic of much modern accentuation (in the unscientific meaning of the term) quite distinct from musical accent, which may or may not fall on the same syllable with the stress. A Welsh child in bidding another "good-morning," with the 'good' suppressed, utters "morning" with a strong stress on the *morn-* and a fine musical oxytone on the *-ing*, as I have frequently heard in Mid-Wales.' With this interesting illustration of the coördination of stress and pitch compare the summaries of Hannsen's articles in A. J. P. V 117 and VI 383, and especially in reference to the survival of pitch in modern Greek my note on V 118.

Nearly ten years have passed since Charles Graux was called away in the flush of youthful achievement (see A. J. P. III 117-119), but there seems to be no danger that his name will be consigned to 'dumb forgetfulness.' Every year brings some fresh tribute to his worth, and the latest is one that he himself would have prized most highly. In the *Facsimilés de Manuscrits Grecs d'Espagne gravés d'après les photographies de CHARLES GRAUX* (Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1891), M. ALBERT MARTIN, himself a distinguished palaeographer, has not only honored the memory of the brilliant young genius, whose career reminds one of the early wonders of the history of classical study, but has also done admirable service to Greek scholars, who will find in these eighteen plates, with their sixty-three specimens of MSS, almost all the important points that could interest the student of palaeography, almost all kinds of uncials and minuscules, feats of calligraphy, prodigies of abbreviation, palimpsests, miniatures, the character of the material, the character of ornamentation. Three of the plates were added by M. Martin, who has accompanied the whole with a copious palaeographical commentary, and has thus given us a collection which should form part of the outfit of every institution in which higher Greek studies are pursued.

The appearance of this superb work recalls a little manual recently put forth by M. CUCUEL, *Éléments de paléographie grecque* (Paris, Klincksieck). The book does not profess to be anything else than a popular summary of Gardthausen's well-known work, and the original is followed so closely that little or no heed is taken of all that has been done since 1879. This failure to bring the book up to date has, of course, called forth severe animadversion, but it cannot be denied that the plan is useful. A pocket volume, brief and lucid, well and clearly printed, containing the leading facts and principles of a branch of study which is becoming more and more imperative for classical students, will find acceptance, even if it be wrong here and antiquated

there. It may be added that the Klincksieck series, so far as the volumes that compose it are known to the Journal, seems to meet the needs of the French schools better than those of our schools are met. Most of the books are translated from the German, but names like those of RIEMANN, the admirable grammarian, who perished last summer in the Alps, and of BONNET, made famous by his great work on Gregory of Tours, suffice to show that translation and adaptation are not all.

In MAX BÜDINGER's suggestive memoir, *Poesie und Urkunde bei Thukydides* (Denkschriften der kaiserlichen Akademie in Wien, 1891), the ingenious author has discussed the question of the official Persian style, as shown in Xerxes' reply to the proposition of Pausanias (Th. 1, 129). This Persian 'Kanzleistil' is a matter, as Büdinger notes, about which we have very scant information. The style of Persian proclamations, as exhibited in the inscriptions, is not suitable for a letter; Herodotos took no interest in such things; Ktesias presents nothing that is available, so that Büdinger has to take refuge in those books of the Old Testament that have to do especially with Persian affairs. Of the four, Daniel, he remarks, is to be used with great caution, Esther is a sad blending of accurate knowledge with inventive fancy, Nehemiah, like Herodotos, had no appreciation of official style, and Ezra alone remains to comfort us with a formula that is almost identical with the one employed in Thukydides: 'Ὡς δὲ λέγει βασιλεὺς Ξέρξης, says Thukydides (1, 129, 2), τάδε λέγει ὁ βασιλεὺς Περσῶν 'Κῦρος, says Ezra 1, 2 (οὕτως εἶπεν Κῦρος βασιλεὺς Περσῶν another text), with which comp. 2 Chr. 3, 23: τάδε λέγει Κῦρος βασιλεὺς Περσῶν. There are turns in the letter which, according to Büdinger's judgment, would gain very much by a retroversion into Xerxes' native language, and it is to be hoped that some Oriental scholar will undertake the simple task of rendering the work of Xerxes' Ionic secretary into the original. Meantime it may be interesting to compare two passages from Greek authors who were evidently not so dead to the peculiarities of Persian 'Kanzleistil' as were Nehemiah and Herodotos. In his oration against Ktesiphon, Aischines says (§238): ὁ γὰρ τῶν Περσῶν βασιλεὺς οὐ πολλῷ πρότερον χρόνῳ πρὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάνδρου διαβάσεως εἰς τὴν Ἀσίαν κατέπεμψε τῷ δήμῳ καὶ μάλα ὑβριστικὴν καὶ βάρβαρον ἐπιστολὴν, ἐν ᾗ τὰ τε ἄλλα καὶ μάλ' ἀπαιδεύτως διελέχθη καὶ ἐπὶ τελευτῆς ἐνέγραψεν ἐγὼν, φησὶν, ὑμῖν χρυσίον οὐ δώσω· μή μ' αἰτεῖτε· οὐ γὰρ λήψετε σθε. With a fine feeling for Persian 'Kanzleistil' Aristophanes makes Pseudartabas say in the Acharnians (v. 104), οὐ λῆψι χρῖσο, χαυνόπρωκτ' Ἴαοναῦ, and one regrets that this striking parallel is not to be found in the two most recent editions of Aischines that I have consulted. Perhaps it was beneath the dignity of a text-book, or the words escaped the eye of the commentators as they escaped the Eye of the King.

Dr. ALFRED BIESE, an enthusiastic advocate of the introduction of the Greek lyric poets into the cycle of gymnasial studies, has shown his faith in the doctrine which he has preached with great fervor in a recent number of the Jahrbücher for 1891 (Paedagogische Abtheilung, p. 415) by publishing a selection called *Griechische Lieder in Auswahl* (Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1891). Such a

selection has long been needed, and the passages are in the main judiciously chosen. Thus far the text only has appeared, the type being large and fair as one expects in the Freytag publications, the price a trifle. Unfortunately some bad misprints occur, things that should be sedulously avoided in a book intended for beginners, and there are other marks of haste. E. g. in the epigram from Arabios, p. 89, the words *εις προάστειον*, either in the original or in translation, should have been prefixed to the poem, which without such a superscription is a puzzle. It is a pleasure to note, however, that in Solon, fr. 36, 20 B. follows the *Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* in reading *πρὶν ἀνταράξας* . . . *ἐξεῖλεν*, whereas Kaibel and Wilamowitz in their edition of the *Ἀ. II.* have returned to the ungrammatical Plutarchean text.

Cicero was the greatest wit of his time, though in contemplating his jokes one is often reminded of the famous line,

L'esprit qu'on veut avoir gâte l'esprit qu'on a,

and the second Philippic, Juvenal's 'divina Philippica,' is no exception to Gresset's rule. But for all that Cicero deserves a better fate than to have his bitter jest, 'Tuum hominis simplicis pectus vidimus' (Phil. 2, 43, 111) translated as it has been translated into the bald literalism of 'We have seen your breast (that) of a simple man.' This rendering is the first that caught my eye as I opened the third edition of Professor GEORGE G. RAMSAY'S *Latin Prose Composition* at p. 114 (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press; New York, Macmillan & Co., 1892). It was a sad disappointment, for better things were to be expected of Professor Ramsay (see A. J. P. VIII 254), but until we have better models than the pointless, slovenly, inaccurate, and sometimes grossly false translations of 'epoch-making' grammars, what are we to look for from their copyists?

In an article *On some apparent anomalies in the use of μή*, published in the *Transactions of the Oxford Philological Society* for 1889-90, Mr. J. COOK-WILSON has made repeated reference to my paper *Encroachments of μή on οὐ in later Greek* (A. J. P. I 45 foll.); and I have no reason to be dissatisfied with the tone of his comments, though he takes care to say that he has 'borrowed no principle or criticism from it,' and that in case of agreement on important points we have both been anticipated by earlier writers. I most assuredly made no claim of originality in my little plea for the despised *Graeculi*, and took for granted that the differences between *οὐ* and *μή* in classical Greek were 'sufficiently well known, if not sufficiently well formulated nor referred to sufficiently satisfactory causes.' Aken, Baümlein, Kühner, Madvig, to whom Mr. Cook-Wilson refers, were known to me. To Gayler's book I did not have access at the time, and now that I have access to it I do not think that I should have gained much (for the subject then in hand) from the uncritical mass of material. The observation of the peculiar tone, not to use so doubtful a word as emphasis, of *μή* with *δυννμι* and words of kindred meaning is certainly not a matter for which Gayler could claim priority. But truth is better than originality, and Mr. Cook-Wilson's independent conclu-

sions are very welcome to me as confirmations of the views I had reached, and I am sorry that the coincidences are not more numerous than they are. But I should be still sorrier if I thought that Mr. Cook-Wilson attributed to me the entire text of the articles on *οὐ* and *μή* in the seventh ed. of Liddell and Scott, which the editors have doctored to suit their notions, and sometimes in flat contradiction to what they have seen fit to retain of the original. So under *μή* especial attention was called at the outset to the force of a leading imperative. This has been retained, but the example has been suppressed: O. C. 1154: *δίδασκέ με | ὥς μή εἰδότες* to reappear in a false connexion (B 6).

The points of most interest in Mr. Cook-Wilson's paper are his application of what I should call the 'free negative' *μή* to certain Aristotelian passages, and his objection to calling *μή* the natural negative of the infinitive. *Mή* with the inf. he thinks is due (1) to the logical tendency which developed itself in the Greek language, and (2) to the emphasis in special cases which assimilated the construction of the principal verb to that of a verb of asseveration. The logical tendency (conception) and the expression of will (prohibition) are, according to Mr. Cook-Wilson, to be kept apart. 'Whatever,' he says, 'the ultimate common ancestry of the two meanings of *μή*, they are as distinct uses as if they were represented by two different words'; and it is only too plain that he would reject what seems to others the evident development of *oratio obliqua* from the dative inf., the imperative inf. (*μή*), the final inf. (*μή*), verbs of will and endeavor (*μή*), verbs of asseveration (*μή*), verbs of statement echoing an indicative *oratio obliqua* expressed or conceived (neg. *οὐ*). The future infinitive is a necessity of *oratio obliqua* and was created by that necessity, and Homer uses it freely, but he has a marked aversion to the use of *οὐ* with inf.—which he employs seldom and only under special circumstances. The negative is usually combined with the leading verb, and in the whole Homeric corpus there are not examples enough to warrant the theory that *οὐ* is the original negative of the inf. Of this more hereafter.

The last few months have ushered in a number of important and interesting works pertaining to the wider aspects of philology, but it is not invidious to say that none is more important or interesting than Mr. FREEMAN's *History of Sicily* (Oxford, At the Clarendon Press. New York, Macmillan & Co.), in the first two volumes of which the story of the island in which the eminent historian sees the prefigurement of North America is brought down to the beginning of the Athenian intervention. As the work is to be continued to the time of the Sicilian kings, and for aught one knows to the time of Garibaldi, the scope of the great undertaking inspires respect for the enterprise of the unwearied veteran. The execution of the portion that lies before us has received the highest praise in more than one journal from a distinguished worker in the same field, Adolf Holm, and those who have not the same right to pronounce judgment may at least be permitted to express their indebtedness to Mr. Freeman for the new light and the new life that have been brought into a history, fascinating enough of itself. With details of style and statement every one will have some quarrel. Quiet souls will resent the fife and drum movement that leaves one no rest from beginning to end, but when the march

is over, one is better for the exercise even if a little fretted by the high pitch and the perpetual iteration. Sometimes Mr. Freeman bullies the unfortunate philologist into concessions which the unfortunate philologist would be willing to make without being bullied. Who denies that it would be a great gain to historic truth if Pindar's Epinikia were presented in chronological order? But there is no gain to historic truth in calling Pindar a 'flatterer' and 'a laureate,' and no help to historic vision in a sneer at the charming little ode in honor of Ergoteles (O. 12). The 'Persian bird' has lost something of his poetry in the lapse of time, and 'the cock of the walk' is not so brave a figure as the ἀλέκτωρ of Pindar's day, but the continuity of history must not be allowed to vulgarize the past. However one is thankful to Mr. Freeman that in spite of his admiration of Mr. Bury he has had the good sense not to accept the ingenious Irishman's Pindaric puns, some of which he throws overboard remorselessly to keep company with Mr. Verrall's Κόραξ (the rhetorician) of O. 2, 96.

Slight lapses in a work that involves so many details may be left to the microscopic critics, but it may not be considered carping to find it odd that so close a student of Thucydides' account of Sicily should in his excursus on 'Kings and Tyrants in Sicily' have overlooked Archonides τῶν ταύτης Σικελῶν βασιλέων (Th. 7, 1, 4), and still stranger that in a note on the 'Pious Brethren of Katané' he cites no earlier authority than Strabo. See the prodigious mass of literature in Mätzner's edition of Lykurgos, §95.

The next volume will deal with the Sicilian Expedition, and if Mr. Freeman has been able to freshen up the faded figure of Ducetius, what may we not expect when we come to a period so suggestive of parallels and prophecies as is the time of the Attic War? In any case we are happy to learn in advance that Mr. Freeman shares Holm's opinion of the trustworthiness of Thucydides: 'That Thucydides,' he says (II 419), 'had stepped out every inch of the battleground of Syracuse, I feel as sure as that I have done so in his steps'—a sentence that must be read more than once and is worth reading more than once.

Another book of general interest is the collection of essays and addresses which Professor BUTCHER has put forth under the vague title *Some Aspects of the Greek Genius* (London and New York, Macmillan & Co.). In his brilliant inaugural address as Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh, Mr. Butcher sums up 'what we owe to Greece' in a way that shows what the author himself owes to Greece. 'The Greek Idea of the State' enforces the great lessons of Greek political life that we are apt to forget amid the mechanical progress of modern times. In the article on Sophocles the problem of the relation of suffering and guilt in the Sophoclean drama is thoughtfully pondered. 'The Melancholy of the Greeks' is intended to correct the common notion that the Greeks were a light-hearted people, and we are taught to listen to the strains of sadness that are vocal throughout their literature. Under the heading 'The written and the spoken word,' Mr. Butcher brings out the contrast between the Greek talking and our reading world; and 'The Unity of Learning' is a plea for the universal in the special, for wide vision as well as for close vision. The themes are all more or less familiar to the professional

scholar, and startling novelty would be incompatible with sound judgment, but they are all discussed with grace and point and happy illustrations. Of especial interest and value for the student of Greek literature is the concluding course on 'Aristotle's Conception of Fine Art and Poetry.' Here also the work of the Germans is inevitable, but any one who knows anything of the literature will be delighted to see how often the misty, tortuous and muddy path has been transmuted into a bright and straight and solid road by the clear mind and the literary skill of the Edinburgh professor.

In an important essay entitled *Election by Lot at Athens. Prince Consort Dissertation*, 1890 (Cambridge, At the University Press; New York, Macmillan & Co.), Mr. J. C. HEADLAM has given us an interesting study and an incidental defence of an institution which he considers to be 'of the very essence of democracy.' But what manner of democracy? Not Milton's 'fierce democratic,' still less the 'unterrified democracy' of American politics. The truth is, as Mr. Headlam says, that 'the Athenian democracy was an aristocracy'—a simple fact that students are too often allowed to ignore. The Athenian democracy, he continues, 'had all the characteristics of an aristocracy. It made the assumption that each citizen had the time and ability to undertake public duties. It was then held true that no man could be a good citizen whose life was fully occupied in earning the bare necessities of life. The Athenians had in fact that respect for leisure which is so characteristic of an aristocracy. Hard work was for them a disqualification. Men did not believe in the dignity of labor. The existence of the democracy depended on slavery. Slavery is now impossible. Our modern democracies are no more aristocratic. If they ever become so, it will be when the use of machinery is so far developed and society reorganized in such a way that the greater part of the population will be able, as the wealthy classes now do, to devote a portion of their ample leisure, not only to the discussion of political questions, but also to the management of public business.' 'As the wealthy classes now do' is a clause that has no applicability to America. America, if we can trust pessimistic journalists, is largely governed by an oligarchy of the lower elements of society, whose 'ample leisure' is secured by plundering the public; and Mr. Headlam shows that the Athenian democratic system had the great merit of making fraud difficult. 'There was a good deal of petty dishonesty at Athens, many men made a little money out of the public service. But we know of no instance in which we can say that the public welfare was seriously injured by extensive frauds or official incompetence, as was constantly the case in aristocratic Rome and England.' And in a foot-note he alludes to the 'gigantic corruption which is said to prevail in Russia, Italy and America,' and which 'would' in Athens 'have been quite impossible.'